NERRS Science Collaborative Progress Report for the Period 03/01/2013 through 08/31/2013

Project Title: **Partnership for Coastal Watersheds**

Project Coordinator: Craig Cornu, South Slough NERR
Fiscal Agent: Pam Wilson, South Slough NERR
Project Start Date: Sept 1, 20012
Report compiled by: Craig Cornu
Contributing team members and their roles in the project:

Jenni Schmitt, SSNERR, Applied Science Investigator/Assistant Project Coordinator/Data Manager
Jon Souder, Coos Watershed Assn. (CoosWA): Applied Science Investigator
Bessie Joyce, CoosWA: Co-collaborative lead (departing from CoosWA)
Alexa Carleton, CoosWA: Co-collaborative lead (newly hired by CoosWA)
Alicia Helms, SSNERR: Applied Science Investigator
Adam Demarzo, SSNERR: Applied Science Investigator
David Sutherland, University of Oregon: Applied Science Investigator
Elise Hamner, Oregon International Port of Coos Bay: End User Representative
Chris Claire, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife: End User Representative
Members of the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds Steering Committee: End User Representatives and Technical Advisors

A. Progress overview

The overall goal of the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds (PCW) Phase 2 project is to apply lessons learned from the first phase of the PCW to:

- Provide for our community the tools with which to understand long-term environmental and socioeconomic change in our watersheds and communities including the expansion of South Slough NERR's estuarine water quality network to the Coos estuary in partnership with local tribes, the facilitation of a Coos estuary hydrodynamic model, and the development of a suite of environmental and socioeconomic indicators for the community.
- Characterize and model specific community-relevant attributes associated with the:
    1) Local effects of climate change;
    2) Local effects of human activities and land use changes; and
    3) Cumulative effects of changes our community makes as we work towards the community vision by implementing the Partnership Action Plan.

During this reporting period the Partnership Steering Committee has approved the scope of the PCW Phase 2 as proposed by the Partnership Steering Committee Transition Team. As described in the last progress report, the group is doing its work in project-specific subcommittees (Coos Estuary Inventory Project Subcommittee, Estuary Monitoring Tools and Indicators Subcommittee, and Action Plan Implementation Subcommittee), with a Coordinating Subcommittee formed to undertake "big picture" tasks beyond the scope of individual project subcommittees. For example, the Coordination Subcommittee engages in outreach activities that support the work of individual projects and lays the groundwork in the community for future projects (e.g., speaker series, training workshops) for which the current projects are providing a critical foundation (e.g., climate change vulnerability assessment, adaptation planning, county-wide community visioning). The Coordinating Subcommittee also organizes

full-membership Partnership Steering Committee meetings which are now held quarterly, instead of monthly. See Attachment 1 for a description of the PCW Phase 2 strategy.

We've made progress on expanding the SSNERR's system-wide water quality monitoring network into the Coos estuary by purchasing the YSI EXO2 6600 sondes and securing the permits, permissions and contracts required to mount the instruments (and associated deployment tubes) on newly established and existing pilings in the estuary. We have also purchased the Solinst LTC Junior loggers, secured required permissions, and have begun to deploy the loggers and one of two acoustic doppler current profilers (SonTek) in the Coos estuary under the direction of Dr. Dave Sutherland to collect data that will help validate the hydrodynamic model. A rudimentary version of the model can be viewed here and here (may take a little time to open in default web browser).

We are also updating the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds web site (www.partnershipforcoastalwatersheds.org).

B. Working with intended users

Members of the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds Partnership Steering Committee (PSC) and the associated project-specific subcommittees include both intended users and intended user representatives.

Coos Estuary Inventory Project Subcommittee

During this reporting period, project coordinator Craig Cornu (SSNERR) worked with three Partnership Steering Committee members with deep contacts in the community (former member of the Coquille Indian Tribe, a local Airport Board Commissioner and economic development consultant, and a local private sector land use planning consultant) to recruit key community members to participate on the Coos Estuary Inventory Project subcommittee. It was clear from the beginning that the inventory project would not succeed without the participation of representatives from those organizations who would be the primary users of the inventory. These organizations included Coos County, the City of Coos Bay, the City of North Bend, Oregon International Port of Coos Bay and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

We held a series of 2-on-1 or 2-on-2 meetings with representatives of those organizations in which we summarized the goals of the project and its benefits to their organizations and community, and invited their participation as members of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project subcommittee (see Coos Estuary Inventory Project components, example uses and data validity in Attachment 2).

We met with representatives of the Coos County Planning Department and DLCD on 3/18/2013; with representatives of the City of Coos Bay on 5/10/2013; with a representative of the City of North Bend on 6/3/2013; and with representatives of the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay on 6/6/2013. Additional meetings are planned with representatives of other organizations (e.g., Coos Bay Chamber of commerce, Coos Bay-North Bend Water Board, Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, Coos Ship Pilots Association).

We have also delivered public presentations to the following organizations by both invitation and at our suggestion: Bay Area Rotary Club (3/4/2013); SSNERR Management Commission (3/28/2013); City of North Bend (4/9/2013); City of Coos Bay (6/4/2013). Additional presentations are planned (e.g., Coos County Board of Commissioners, Oregon International Port of Coos Bay).

On July 1, 2013, Craig Cornu and Jenni Schmitt convened the first Coos Estuary Inventory Project subcommittee meeting at which we presented our proposed approach to developing the inventory (go here to view the PowerPoint presentation we used to guide the meeting discussion). We were able to include in the meeting all Coos Estuary Inventory Project subcommittee members except the representative from the City of North Bend who has not yet responded to our invitation to join the group (the rest of the subcommittee reinforced the importance of the city of North Bend's participation in helping guide the inventory) and the representative from DLCD who had a scheduling conflict. The project discussions were lively. Action items from the meeting were as follows:

1. Geographic Scope- We heard subcommittee members reinforce the proposed approach which has the project boundary including the Coos estuary and the lands that drain directly into the estuary. But they wanted us to make sure to include the Coos River/Millicoma sub-basins as well, which was not included the boundary we proposed at the meeting. *Subcommittee members were asked to review the maps (original and newly proposed project boundaries) and give us feedback about the newly proposed physical boundaries of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project.*

2. Inventory Content 1- We had a great discussion at the meeting about the need for the inventory to be an objective presentation of scientific status and trends information. We heard agreement that the inventory would not include any recommendations for any specific actions, but that it would still include evaluations of the status and trends information. We recommended that the group look at how evaluations of status and trends information were handled in the PCW Phase 1 State of the Watersheds assessment and consider whether that same, similar, or an improved approach would be acceptable for the Coos Estuary Inventory Project. *Subcommittee members were asked to review the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds Phase 1 State of the Watersheds assessment (in the binder we handed out at the meeting and online here) and let us know what they think about how we handled the evaluations of the environmental and socio-economic attributes included in that document.*

3. Inventory Content 2- We heard in no uncertain terms the group's recommendation that the Coos Estuary Inventory Project have the same effort, level of detail and scientific rigor expended on the socio-economic data compilation and analyses as on the environmental part of the inventory. *Subcommittee members were asked to define the additional level of detail they would find the most useful by reviewing the State of the Watersheds assessment and telling us what additional socio-economic questions they feel should be addressed in the inventory.*

4. Subcommittee Membership- Subcommittee *members were asked to review a list and let us know: 1) what additional individuals and/or organizations need to be involved in this project as members of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project subcommittee; and 2) who the best person would be for us to contact at those organizations*.

Since the meeting, SSNERR staff has developed a strategy with applied science investigator Jon Souder (CoosWA) who is the project lead on all things socio-economic, to shift resources in the CoosWA subcontract to support the additional capacity needed to expand the socio-economic content of the inventory at the request of the subcommittee.

We have also held several discussions with the representatives from the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay (who were very productive meeting participants) about the motives behind the Coos Estuary Inventory Project and the membership of the inventory project subcommittee and the Partnership

Steering Committee. There are some trust issues that go beyond the inventory project and the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds which SSNERR staff is working through with Port staff (next meeting coming up 9/2/2013). It's critical to note here the indispensable role that the PCW continues to play in creating the opportunity for us to work on some long-standing issues that might not otherwise get addressed and that have clear benefits beyond the project(s) that initiated the conversation.

Action Plan Implementation Subcommittee

During this reporting period, project co-collaborative lead, Bessie Joyce (CosWA) worked to develop the membership of the Action Plan Implementation Subcommittee and convened their first meeting on 8/8/2013. Action items from the meeting were as follows:

- Develop an actions table with action items or benchmarks to track progress (See Attachment 3)
- Update the PCW Phase 1 Action Plan, including illustrating the links between the "How Are We Doing" evaluations in the State of the Watersheds and the actions articulated in the Action Plan. Meeting participants were asked to review the plan and offer editorial comments to facilitators.
- Tasks associated with specific actions:
    - Look into SSNERR internship to help coordinate outreach education actions
    - Work in in partnership with existing programs to find support for coastal hazards outreach and education.
    - CoosWA staff will begin developing habitat restoration projects based on the South Slough and Coastal Frontal watershed assessment findings
    - Determine how actions associated with the Port of Coos Bay's Charleston Master Plan overlaps with PCW action plan
    - Determine the extent to which the Coos Historical and Maritime Museum is incorporating more cultural history into school curricula
    - Investigate opportunities for partnering with others on Early Detection Rapid Response program for invasive species

See Action Plan Implementation Subcommittee 8/8/2013 meeting notes in Attachment 4.

Coordination Subcommittee

During this reporting period, project co-collaborative lead, Bessie Joyce (CoosWA) worked to develop the membership of the Coordination Subcommittee and convened their first meeting on 8/6/2013. Action items from the meeting were as follows:

- Work to define the Coordination Subcommittee's purpose and role with respect to the other PCW subcommittees
- Review the PCW's guiding principles and define PCW services to the community
- Contribute to SSNERR staff's efforts to update and improve the PCW web site
- Recruit additional members for the coordination subcommittee

See Coordination Subcommittee 8/6/2013 meeting notes in Attachment 5.

Estuary Monitoring Tools and Indicators Subcommittee

During this reporting period, project coordinator Craig Cornu and project assistant coordinator Jenni Schmitt have not yet formally convened the Estuary Monitoring Tools and Indicators Subcommittee. Collaboration among technical partners and end users has been occurring "organically" to facilitate progress on tools development. Partners and end users include University of Oregon hydrodynamic

model scientists, graduate students and faculty at the Oregon Institute of Marine Biology, technicians and divers from the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, technicians from the Coquille Indian Tribe, and representatives from the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay, US Coast Guard, Oregon Department of Transportation and the Coos Bay Ship Pilots Association. The Coos Bay Ship Pilots Association is a key end user who influenced the placement of one of the permanent water quality monitoring stations we're establishing. Since the sondes will report real-time water level data (with support from another funding source), we worked with the pilots association to place one of the sondes at the base of Coos Bay's McCullough Bridge where they most need real-time water level information as they guide ships up and down the bay. We will formalize the Estuary Monitoring Tools and Indicators Subcommittee in the next reporting period.

C. Progress on project objectives for this reporting period:

Objective 1: Discuss and develop consensus among the full Partnership Steering Committee about Transition Team recommendations

As reported previously, the PCW Transition Team met three times to develop recommendations for how to incorporate lessons learned from the PCW Phase 1 into the project's next phase. Those recommendations, as summarized in the document included here as Attachment 1, were approved by the full Partnership Steering Committee via an email decision-making process (see email solicitation in Attachment 6) and presented and discussed further at the 6/6/2013 Partnership Steering Committee meeting.

Objective 2: Develop and begin implementing a plan for how the PCW Partnership Steering Committee will facilitate an update of the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan (CBEMP).

See the description of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project above. It's important to note that the project has evolved from the Partnership Steering Committee playing a role in updating the CBEMP, to a Partnership Steering Committee subcommittee developing a State of the Watersheds-like inventory of the environmental and socioeconomic conditions in the Coos estuary that would facilitate a revision of the CBEMP. The inventory is now seen as an effort that will have many other functions in addition to its role helping the county revise the CBEMP (see the Example Uses page in Attachment 2).

Objective 3: Recruit additional members for the PCW Partnership Steering Committee representative of the expanded PCW Phase 2 project area and relevant to Phase 2 tasks

Additional Partnership Steering Committee members have been recruited as members of the three active project subcommittees. Recruitment methods for the Coos Estuary Inventory Project are described above.

Objective 4: Secure permits and develop contract for establishing pilings for new SWMP stations in the Coos estuary

State and Federal permits have been secured and a contract signed with a local marine construction firm who will establish the pilings needed for the new Coos estuary system-wide water quality monitoring stations. Construction will begin in September, now that permitting work widow has been moved up for this project (normally the work window for work in the main part of the estuary begins October 15). For

existing pilings being used for these stations we are still waiting for our waterway structure registration paperwork to be approved by the Oregon Department of State Lands.

Objective 5: Deploy at least two of the new SWMP stations in the Coos estuary
Deploy all loggers for validating the hydrodynamic model

We are behind schedule for deploying the new Coos estuary system-wide water quality monitoring stations. We anticipate installing infrastructure and instruments for at least two of the stations in the fall of 2013. We are also behind schedule for deploying the loggers for validating the hydrodynamic model. Three factors have caused delays for us: 1) The Onset HOBO conductivity-temperature loggers we had specified in the grant proposal to use for this purpose were recalled just before we were making the purchase and resulted in additional time needed to research alternative loggers; 2) we ordered the Solinst conductivity-temperature loggers and did not realize until the loggers finally arrived that the ones we ordered were not rated for the depths at which they were to be deployed- so we had to send them back and re-order which took a not insignificant amount of time; and 3) the time required to gain permission to attach the loggers to the US Coast Guard-managed waterway structures in the Coos estuary jumped in complexity from a simple phone call and verbal okay to a more involved permit-style process. We have the permission required but it took much longer than it has in the past.

Objective 6: Complete next edition of the State of the Watersheds assessment and begin Coos estuary-wide State of the Watersheds assessment

This objective is in process. Additional data summaries have been prepared for an updated edition of the State of the Watersheds assessment (including an executive summary, community survey methods and information about the status and trends of lamprey eels, large mammals and amphibians) but have not yet been incorporated into the layout for a revised edition. The Coos estuary-wide State of the Watersheds assessment will be completed as the Coos Estuary Environmental and Socioeconomic Inventory under the direction of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project subcommittee (see description above).

Objective 7: Complete draft environmental and socioeconomic indicators- plan for fall technical advisory group meeting

While we have completed some initial planning work for the environmental and socioeconomic indicators, we have placed this project on the back burner while we prioritize related tasks associated with the Coos Estuary Inventory Project. Our thinking is that the Partnership Steering Committee's task of defining the most appropriate and relevant indicators, which will, by necessity, be based on data from existing monitoring programs and on-going monitoring projects, will be greatly facilitated by the data compilation and data gap identification being undertaken as part of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project.

Objective 8: Complete presentations to community organizations including local government - develop outreach plan (?)

As noted above, presentations to the community are on-going. Outreach planning will likely be undertaken by the Coordination Subcommittee.

Project objectives for the next six months

- Complete a draft of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project ready for review by the subcommittee- to include a significantly more robust socioeconomic assessment of the Coos Bay area.

- Complete the deployment of all four new Coos estuary system-wide water quality monitoring stations. And the station at the McCullough Bridge *may* also be outfitted with real-time telemetry equipment.

- Complete the deployment of all loggers associated with validating the Coos estuary hydrodynamic model, including at least one Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler (ADCP) (with another ADCP possibly to be provided by the University of Oregon scientists).

- Convene at least one meeting of the Estuary Monitoring Tools and Indicators Subcommittee and collect feedback about the tools we're developing.

- With the help of the comments and edits offered by the Action Plan Implementation subcommittee, complete a revised edition of the PCW Phase 1 Action Plan.

- SSNERR staff to complete a second edition of the State of the Watersheds assessment.

- The Action Plan Implementation subcommittee will have several projects under development that address priority actions listed in the PCW Phase 1 Action Plan.

- The Coordination subcommittee will have developed an outreach plan, implemented outreach actions that helps more people in the community to understand and support the work of Partnership Steering Committee members, and will have convened the Partnership Steering Committee to report on the status of the subcommittees' project. The Coordination subcommittee may even have developed a strategic plan for the PCW that identifies what the group wants to do beyond the current projects.

D. Benefit to NERRS and NOAA: This project is designed to directly serve/benefit the communities of North Bend and Cos Bay, Oregon by providing relevant environmental and socio-economic information, implementing needed projects, and continuing to facilitate productive discussion among the disparate segments of our communities. To the extent that the processes we're using to reach our project goals are applicable to other NERRs (and associated coastal communities), and inform the implementation and evaluation of NOAA programs, this project may provide additional, more far-reaching benefits to additional audiences.

E. Additional Information: Nothing additional to report.

Attachment 1

Partnership for Coastal Watersheds Steering Committee: Phase 2 Strategy

Partnership for Coastal Watersheds (PCW) Phase 2 projects are aligned with the following three objectives to be pursued in parallel:

- **Coos Estuary Inventory Project**
  - An environmental and socio-economic inventory for the Coos Estuary and associated sub-basins to provide up-to-date "baseline" information for the community that could also be used to satisfy inventory requirements for a revision of the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan (CBEMP).
  - Inventory could lead to:
    - A Sustainable Design Action Team (SDAT)-like conversation among community members about their priorities to answer questions such as:
      - What is the community's vision for where it wants to be in 10 and 20 years?
      - How can that vision be supported by a revised approach to the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan?
    - A community investigation into the ways in which the county may be vulnerable to climate-related changes (including sea level rise and storm surges) and how likely it is that those changes will happen; when/where anticipated changes could take place and what the community can do to minimize and/or prepare for those changes.
  - Would likely be supplemented by "coastal zone management 101" and other training for the community

- **Coos Estuary Monitoring Tools**: Coos estuary water quality network, hydrodynamic model, environmental and socioeconomic indicators
  - supports the State of the Coos Estuary Inventory/CBEMP update
  - provides the community with scientific status and trends and predictive modeling information to help inform community decision making about the Coos estuary and associated sub-basins

- **Phase 1 PCW Action Plan Implementation**
  - focus on developing projects to address priority actions outlined in the PCW's first phase
  - suggests potential process for Coos estuary and sub-basins action plan development

Work associated with the PCW Phase 2 objectives will be done by sub-committees:

Proposed Subcommittees of the Partnership Steering Committee:

1. **Coos Estuary Inventory Project Committee** – Guides the development of the environmental and socio-economic inventory for the Coos estuary. Develops the community partnerships necessary to make the inventory a success and appropriate as the foundation for a CBEMP update and other inventory uses.

2. **Estuary Monitoring Tools and Indicators Committee**- Oversees the development of the PCW Phase 2 monitoring tools and conceives of end uses for the tools so we make sure the tools are developed in response to those needs.

3. **Action Plan Implementation Committee** - Coordinates implementation of Phase 1 Action Plan and partner engagement.

4. **Coordination Committee** – Members of each subcommittee and PCW facilitators (CoosWA, SSNERR etc.) form an oversight group to coordinate PCW outreach and organize quarterly PCW meetings at which subcommittee progress is discussed and issues addressed.

- **Sub-committees** will meet approximately monthly, or as needed, to achieve objectives.

- **The full committee** will meet quarterly to report progress and assess PCW needs.

Attachment 2

Coos Estuary Inventory Project

Key Project Development Components, Example Uses, & Data Validity

Key Components of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project	Purpose	Who's Responsible	*Proposed* Completion Date
1. Formation of Coos Estuary Inventory Project Subcommittee	The Coos Estuary Inventory Project Subcommittee guides decisions about what the Coos Estuary Inventory Project is, who is involved and what their roles are, and the content of the inventory documents and web elements.	Subcommittee members (as of July 1, 2013): OR International Port of Coos Bay/David Koch, Elise Hamner; Coos County Planning Office/Jill Rolfe; City of Coos Bay/Rodger Craddock, Eric Day; City of North Bend/Terrence O'Connor (invited); Stuntzner Engineering/Chris Hood; SCDC, Airport Board/Jon Barton; Coquille Indian Tribe/Don Ivy (retired); Department of Land Conservation and Development/Matt Spangler; Coos Watershed Assn./Jon Souder; SSNERR/Craig Cornu, Jenni Schmitt (project staff/facilitators)	Ongoing (additional members to be added per subcommittee recommendations)
2. Articulation of the project boundaries	Defines the geographic scope of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project.	Draft project boundaries proposed by project staff/facilitators, reviewed by subcommittee, and finalized by project staff/facilitators with subcommittee-approved changes.	Proposed July 2013; To be finalized September 2013
3. Planning for inventory content and format	Defines the scope of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project content and how the inventory will be accessed by users.	Draft project content and format proposed by project staff/facilitators, reviewed by subcommittee, and finalized by project staff/facilitators with subcommittee-approved changes.	Proposed July 2013; To be finalized September 2013
4. Environmental Data Acquisition, Writing and GIS Mapping	Environmental data acquisition (compiling data from various relevant sources), data summarization (writing), and GIS mapping are the activities that form the environmental attributes portion Coos estuary inventory document and web elements.	Data acquisition, summarizing and GIS mapping will be undertaken by project staff/facilitators, and periodically reviewed by the project subcommittee and finalized with subcommittee-approved changes.	Initial draft: Spring 2014 Final draft: Winter 2014
5. Socio-Economic Data Acquisition, Writing and GIS Mapping	Socio-economic data acquisition (compiling data sets from others), data summarization (writing), and GIS mapping (as needed) are the activities that form the socio-economic attributes portion Coos estuary inventory document and web elements.	Data acquisition, summarizing and GIS mapping (as needed) will be undertaken by CoosWA staff (Souder) and associated contractors, and periodically reviewed by project staff/facilitators and the project subcommittee and finalized with subcommittee-approved changes.	Initial draft: Spring 2014 Final draft: Winter 2014
6. Format document and web components with easy accessibility of information and readibility in mind	Inventory information will be formatted to make the information readily accessible to a variety of potential users with various data needs.	Inventory will be formatted as proposed by project staff/facilitators, reviewed by subcommittee, and finalized by project staff/facilitators with subcommittee-approved changes.	Initial draft: Spring 2014 Final draft: Winter 2014
7. Project Outreach	The inventory is intended to be a publically accessible document which will only be useful to those who know about it and understand what it is. Project outreach activities will spread the word about the Coos Estuary Inventory Project.	Project staff/facilitators and subcommittee members.	Ongoing

Example Uses

of the Coos Estuary Inventory Project	Example Users	Examples of Who Benefits	Inventory Characteristics to Support this Use
Update and revision of the outdated environmental and socioeconomic inventory that supports the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan (CBEMP), providing a critical first step to the county's revision of the plan and future zoning ordinances at no cost to the county.	Coos County Planning Department, Department of Land Conservation and Development. Coos Bay and North Bend city planners may also use the inventory to update their city zoning ordinances.	Coos County- will not have to fund the entire inventory required to update the CBEMP; revision of the CBEMP could resolve ambiguities in the current plan that can confound both development and conservation efforts.	Scientifically sound data analyses and data summaries, informative to both the lay-person and specialists; Coos estuary-specific environmental status and trends information, inventory website (online access to summarized data with interactive maps and links to raw data)
"First Stop" data source for permit applicants (e.g., fill/removal permits, documents associated with NEPA process...etc.)	Development interests, environmental consultants, tidal wetland mitigation and restoration practitioners, small/rural landowners, county and city planners, permit reviewers (ODFW, ODSL, ODEQ, tribes...etc.)	Individuals and entities that develop or review permit applications associated with activities in and around the Coos estuary; organizations that pay consultants to track down or collect relevant project data.	Centralized, readily accessible, periodically updated, informative to both the lay-person and specialists, Coos estuary-specific environmental and socio-economic status and trends information, inventory website (online access to summarized data with interactive maps and links to raw data)
Baseline data for scientists seeking to conduct research that addresses local, regional, or larger scale issues	Publicly and privately funded researchers needing background data about the Coos estuary to facilitate various environmental, economic, and social research projects and proposals (e.g., native oyster restoration researchers, fisheries scientists, climate change scientists, economic and social science researchers).	Public at large and local decision makers benefit from improved understanding of environmental and socio-economic processes on the coast. For example, the Dungeness crab fishery is a sustainable fishery- Coos estuary status and trends information in the inventory gives researchers valuable context for research investigating how to keep that fishery sustainable; community benefits by facilitating this work in our area, attracting research funding much like Newport's vibrant research community which has attracted some significant research-oriented investment in the local economy.	Centralized, readily accessible, periodically updated, informative to specialists, Coos estuary-specific environmental status and trends information, Coos estuary and environs-specific socioeconomic summary, interactive maps, scientifically sound data analyses, inventory website (online access to summarized data with interactive maps and links to raw data)
Data resource for businesses and municipalities that operate within the Coos estuary	Commercial oyster growers (bacteria status and trends), Coos Bay pilots (real-time water level information at the McCullough Bridge), cities of Coos Bay and North Bend (predictive modeling for sewage outfall planning), OR International Port of Coos Bay (ready access to environmental and socio-economic data), other entities who may need data for grant proposals.	Businesses, municipalities and local decision makers; the community at large who benefits from successful businesses and well-planned municipal infrastructure	Centralized, readily accessible, periodically updated, informative to non-specialists, Coos estuary-specific environmental status and trends information, Coos estuary specific socioeconomic summary, inventory website (online access to summarized data with interactive maps and links to raw data)
Data resource for manufacturing and commercial business looking to invest in our community	External manufacturing and commercial business interests (direct inventory data users), Chamber of Commerce (inventory data users for promotional purposes), etc...For example, businesses would benefit from knowing about the status and trends of local demographics, workforce availability and training, wage expectations...etc.	Community in general benefits from additional investment in our local economy, local businesses and job-seekers, in particular.	Centralized, readily accessible, periodically updated, informative to non-specialists, Coos estuary specific environmental status and trends information, Coos estuary specific socioeconomic summary, inventory website (online access to summarized data with interactive maps and links to raw data)
Characterization of the baseline environmental and socio-economic conditions needed to develop vulnerability assessments and adaptation plans that would help the community understand and prepare for the local effects of climate change	PCW steering committee, CoosWA, SSNERR and others who would likely be involved in developing a climate change vulnerability assessment and adaptation plans for the Coos estuary.	Local decision makers and community benefits from knowing the ways in which the Coos estuary and associated shorelands may or may not be vulnerable to climate-related changes and how likely it is that those changes will happen; when/where anticipated changes could take place and what the community can do to minimize and/or prepare for those changes.	Centralized, readily accessible, periodically updated, informative to both the lay-person and specialists, Coos estuary-specific environmental and socio-economic status and trends information, inventory website (online access to summarized data with interactive maps and links to raw data)
Baseline environmental and socio-economic information for future SDAT-like community visioning efforts	Community organizations/leaders who would be involved in bringing the community together again to undertake an SDAT-like community vision focused on the next 20-25 years.	Local decision makers and community benefit from having a roadmap for the future.	Centralized, readily accessible, periodically updated, informative to non-specialists, Coos estuary specific environmental status and trends information, Coos estuary specific socioeconomic summary, inventory website (online access to summarized data with interactive maps and links to raw data)

Data Validity

for the Coos Estuary Inventory Project

Raw, analyzed and interpreted data presented in the status and trends portion of the inventory (including document and web materials) will be compiled from many different monitoring and research projects and programs. The report will include discussion of the limitations of the data and identified data gaps. The data used in the inventory will only be those collected and analyzed following transparent, repeatable methods. This means the data collection and analysis methods will have been thoroughly documented and reported either in the inventory materials themselves or within the reports, technical manuscripts, and websites from which inventory data were compiled . The purpose of methods transparency and repeatability is to allow anyone to judge the validity of the monitoring or research results, and have the information to challenge those results if deemed necessary.

In the inventory, citations for all data sources will be included. The bibliography will mainly comprise agency reports, peer reviewed literature, project and program websites, and graduate theses. Quality standards for each of these types are described below. Variations from these three formats (i.e. personal communications, anecdotal evidence, etc.) will be explicitly documented as such in the inventory text.

Agency Report - Agencies generally have a Sampling and Analysis Plan, Field Sampling Plan, or Quality Assurance Project Plan for project studies. These are documents that carefully define objectives of the study, methodology (measurement processes and data acquisition), quality assurance procedures and quality control specifications.

Peer reviewed literature- Published technical and academic manuscripts are reviewed by other scientists in a process designed to maintain quality standards and to prevent unwarranted claims, undue influence, or personal bias to gain credence by appearing in published scientific literature.

Graduate Thesis – These research reports are essentially a variation of peer reviewed literature. Quality standards are approved by both academic and non-academic graduate advisory committee members.

Spatial Data- Mapped data are downloaded from various websites and routinely include metadata, which is "data about the "data". This information helps users judge the suitability and quality of the spatial data for their needs. Metadata includes: source, methods used to create the data, accuracy, errors in data, use limitations, completeness, collection dates, data creator's contact information...etc.

Attachment 3

Partnership for Coastal Watersheds Action Plan Sub-committee Near-Term Actions Progress	
Near-Term Actions (1 – 2 Years)	**Progress** (as of 8/12/13)
COMMUNITY	
Outreach and Education:	
• Keep active a future planning and issue discussion forum like the PCW Steering Committee to cooperate on projects and focus on common ground. (1)	• PCW still active. PCW and other community groups, such as the Ford Family Foundation (FFF), planning a community visioning process.
• Provide a forum for resolution of local concerns through an information exchange, discussion forums, and educational opportunities. (20)	• PCW beginning to plan educational opportunities.
• Incorporate more cultural history into school enrichment program curricula and outreach. (24)	• Coos Historical and Maritime Museum has such programs, and PCW may be able to supplement or participate.
• Join efforts to improve local awareness and preparations for environmental hazards (earthquakes and tsunami). (10)	• FFF is involved with education program, PCW may be able to help facilitate.
ECONOMY	
Outreach and Education:	
• Advise county on Comprehensive Plan with regards to shoreline infrastructure, estuary (CBEMP) and wetlands management. (2)	• PCW is moving forward with estuary inventory which will help inform the CBEMP, County has formed a Comprehensive Plan update committee.
Assessment and Monitoring:	
• Identify ways to make the waterfront more appealing to new businesses, investors and visitors. (9)	• *LANELLE WILL PROVIDE UPDATE* • *Port is updating Charleston Master Plan including waterfront improvement projects. PCW may be able to help implement.*
• Assess attractiveness of PCW area to visitors and potential businesses through surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc. (19)	• *Port is updating Charleston Master Plan including waterfront improvement projects. PCW may be able to help implement.*
• Participate in strategic planning and development for the Charleston shipyard, marina, and waterfront for the project area. (21)	• *Port is updating Charleston Master Plan including waterfront improvement projects. PCW may be able to help implement.*
ENVIRONMENT	
Outreach and Education:	
• Educate and engage the community about human impacts on the watershed, with emphasis on the estuary, strategies to reduce those impacts (e.g., low-impact development, stormwater management), and watershed restoration strategies. (16)	
• Educate and engage the community on climate data and methods for mitigating and adapting to effects of climate change. (17)	• SSNERR is developing a social-science intern position that can help coordinate community climate change education prog.

• Provide training in identifying, reporting, and Early Detection Rapid Response for monitoring and treating invasive species. (37)	• SSNERR is developing a social-science intern position that can help coordinate invasive species education program. • Port is installing a boat washing station with educational signs. PCW may be able to assist.
Restoration:	
• Encourage best management practices and seek watershed restoration projects with landowners and managers. (33)Address stream habitat issues identified in the AHI: 1. Pool frequency, depth; 2. Unstable banks; 3. Large wood abundance, volume, frequency; and 4. Gravel abundance, sediment quality. (26)	• CoosWA will conduct spawning surveys in South Slough sub-basin. • CoosWA will begin targeted outreach to high priority landowners, and developing restoration projects in 2013.
• Encourage invasive species control through county ordinances. (35)	
• Continue restoration of native oysters. (29)	• SSNERR and OIMB participate in on-going native oyster restoration.
Assessment and Monitoring:	
• Address "gaps" in freshwater quality data needed for TMDL development (12).	• CoosWA is facilitating Estuary Water Quality Coalition to work with DEQ, and DEQ's TMDL committee, to inventory existing data and assess gaps.
• Continue operating stream gauges at Big, Winchester, and 3 Mile Creeks (18).	• CoosWA continues and is expanding gauging program.
• Develop climate change scenarios, level of certainty and vulnerability assessments. (5)	
• Research effects of climate change on timber industry, forest ecology and fire regime, fish and wildlife habitat and life cycles, wetland function, hydrology, coastal infrastructure, eco-tourism, invasive species, commercial and recreational shellfish production etc. (13)	
• Identify consensus on acceptable "level of risk" for use in planning. E.g., stream damage, sea level rise, upland changes, changes in forest fire regime. (31)	
• Understand and track land use effects on hydrology. (34)	

Attachment 4

Partnership for COASTAL Watersheds

PCW ACTION PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE

MEETING NOTES

August 8, 2013

Coos Bay Public Library, Cedar Room

Present:

Deborah Rudd
Lanelle Comstock
Maggie Allen
Jenni Schmidt
Craig Cornu
Jon Souder
Bessie Joyce

Introductions. There was a round of introductions and a welcome to Lanelle; invited to join us from the Port of Coos Bay and recently working on the Charleston Master Plan update.

Committee Roles. Bessie reviewed the proposed roles for the Action Plan sub-committee which have two tracks: 1) work toward implementation of priority actions developed in Phase 1, and 2) help edit and update the Plan document. She had participants look over the roles which were developed at the June PCW meeting - a printed copy was passed out. It was suggested to add the roles of informing the full committee about the sub-committee progress, and work with the Coodination sub-committee on outreach actions. The sub-committee roles are attached at the end of these notes.

Plan Edits. A May, 2013, draft version of the Action Plan was passed out. Bessie led the group through a quick review of the content and sections of the Action Plan. Jenni asked participants to read through the document and send any editorial comments to her at jenni.schmitt@state.or.us. Craig mentioned that the Plan needs to better illustrate the links between actions and the watershed assessment conditions that the actions address. He will work on inserting the 'score card' graphics from the State of the Watersheds Assessment into the Action Plan to help clarify those links, and will, ideally, include links to performance measures and indicators there too.

Action Implementation. Bessie directed attention to the priority actions summarized in *Table 2 Strategies to implement priority actions.*

- Maggie suggested that the upcoming South Slough intern could help coordinate some of the outreach education actions, such as those related to community education on mitigating the effects of climate change. Maggie work to add this type of activity to the intern job description. Maggie will also check on the cost of using the SWOCC auditorium. Joy and Jenna from South Slough participated in a climate change education training series with the National Network for Ocean and Climate Change Interpretation; maybe they could help coordinate content for a local education program. Oregon Climate Change Research Institute could give presentations. Jon mentioned that getting a spot in the Ron Metzger lecture series might be a good way to reach a wide audience since they are so well known locally. Bessie suggested there could be a multi-tiered approach to the program; 1) public education on climate impacts and adaptation (actions 16, 17),

2) technical recommendations to restoration and land management plans (actions 26, 33, 35 and 29) tracking effects, and assessing vulnerability (actions 5, 13, 31 and 34).

There was discussion about several actions that are already being implemented, at least in part, by the PCW or other organizations.

- Jon mentioned the Ford Family Foundation (FFF) has some funding for improving awareness and preparation for natural hazards, and maybe the PCW could help facilitate an outreach education program. Jon will check on the status of FFF's program. The community college and Community Emergency Response Team could also be involved. (action 10)

- The County Commissioners have put together a Comprehensive Plan update committee. It was suggested that the PCW meet with this committee and share the Action Plan. The PCW Inventory sub-committee's work on the estuary inventory is intended to be a source of information to the County Comprehensive Plan, which includes the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan. (action 2)

- It was suggested that the Action Plan sub-committee recruit someone with a background in education. Jamie Doyle/OSU Sea Grant Extension, and Erik Day/City of Coos Bay Community Development, were both mentioned as potential recruits. PCW could provide the venue and these people could help provide the speakers.

- Jon said he would ask CoosWA staff to begin developing restoration project(s) based on the South Slough and Coastal Frontal watershed assessment findings.

- There was discussion about the need to build action items into the table of priority actions so progress could be tracked. Bessie will work on this. See attached table.

- Lanelle agreed to go over the list of priority actions and comment on how the Port is moving forward with many of these - mostly through the Charleston Master Plan implementation. CoosWA could provide partners and maybe funding for some of the Port's Charleston projects. There was discussion about the invasive species-prevention boat washing station that is planned for the marina. CoosWA has some educational sign resources and contacts. (actions 21 and 37)

- Craig will check with the Coos Historical and Maritime Museum about incorporating more cultural history into school curriculum. Maybe the PCW could help facilitate this in some way. (action 24)

- We discussed the need for invasive species education and Early Detection Rapid Response (EDRR) training. PSU (Center for Lakes and Reservoirs) and OSU Extension (Sam Chan) have programs we could tap into. The PCW may be able to host a series on invasives following an EDRR training. (action 37)

- It was suggested that PCW members take a look at the full list of 159 potential actions and check to see if any lower priority actions should actually be higher priority since issues or conditions may have changed over the past year.

- Bessie will develop a priority action table with action items.

CoosWA's Alexa Carleton will work with PCW members and staff to determine the next meeting date. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:15 pm.

Action Plan Sub-committee Roles (Added 8/8/13)

1. Co-coordinates implementation of Phase 1 priority actions, with staff
    a. Develops partnerships for implementation through outreach and planning
    b. Develops implementation budgets and identifies funding sources
2. Participates in Action Plan update
    a. Edits action plan narrative
    b. Refines action priority
3. Informs full PCW about progress
4. Works with Coordination sub-committee on outreach actions

Attachment 5

Partnership for COASTAL Watersheds

PCW COORDINATION SUB-COMMITTEE

MEETING NOTES

August 6, 2013

Coos Bay Public Library, Cedar Room

Present:

Jenni Schmidt
Anne Farrel-Matthews
Marty Giles
Craig Cornu
Jon Souder
Bessie Joyce
Alexa Carleton
David Petrie

New people and today's goals. Bessie introduced new participants, Anne Farrel-Matthews from SWOCC, and Alexa Carleton, a new CoosWA employee taking Bessie's position later this month. Bessie explained the goal for the meeting was to solidify the role of this committee and begin prioritizing outreach efforts. She also mentioned the need to establish overlap with the other committees as joint members, and explained that we would be refining the draft list of sub-committee roles developed at the June 6th meeting.

Marty asked how project deliverables (deliverables were listed as something this committee would identify for the whole Partnership) fit into the funding requirements with the grantor. Bessie explained that there are required grant deliverables and there are deliverables or products that the committees will develop or accomplish over time (such as inventory data sets and analysis, outreach activities, press release, new partnerships etc.) that would be nice to plan on a time line for the whole group. The grant ends August, 2014, any could likely be extended for another year.

Inventory sub-committee update. Craig gave an update on the Inventory sub-committee:

- The Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan needs to be updated
- Participants met in July and discussed what needs to be in the inventory, data format, geographic area, QA/QC, and a balanced of economic and environmental information
- Rather than updating the Plan, the goal is to update the estuary inventory data and report that informs the Plan
- Much of this information could also be used as baseline data for conducting a climate change vulnerability assessment
- Additional information about health and human services is desired
- A draft of existing inventory data will be expected later in September
- There are some very sensitive politics about the inventory in the community – Craig is working on strengthening trust
- Jenni is managing an Access database with all the data

Will raw inventory data be publicly available? Jon thinks it would be. There was discussion about the format of information and end products – there doesn't seem to be any requirements for specific formats. Neither DLCD nor the County have indicated any requirements for formats. Bessie mentioned a survey could be done to assess user needs and preferences.

Socio-economic assessment. The Inventory sub-committee requested a fair balance of socio-economic assessment and environmental assessment information go into the inventory. Jon is now looking for an appropriate format for the socio-economic assessment work. He's looking at two systems we might use or borrow from. The STAR Communities (Sustainability Tools for Assessing and Rating Communities) program uses a metrics scoring system to evaluate the three 'legs' of sustainability, and has been used all over the country. The program would provide a framework and data layers for socio-economic analysis and scoring rubric using existing data. The other system, Community Vitality, is an OSU Extension program that has been conducted in Tillamook and Wallowa counties to assess community quality of life using 6-8 metrics. We would need to find an appropriate scale for the PCW. Jon is now learning more about these programs. The STAR program can be done by an intern and may be more appropriate for us. It would also make us competitive for a USDA Sustainable Community grant.

Monitoring Tools Sub-committee. The Monitoring Tools sub-committee hasn't yet formed, but collaborations have been on-going. All the estuary monitoring stations are in different stages of development and operation (Jenni passed out a map of the stations and their status).

Craig talked about the hydrodynamic model being developed to model changes in salinity, temperature and currents when, for example, the bay is dredged. Fate of nutrients is also being modeled. The Port is also interested in the model as a tool for the oyster industry and sewage treatment plants. The goal is to make the model an open-source tool that the community can use. Jenni said the modeling program would, ideally, be up and running by next fall, but will likely take longer.

Monitoring tools also include the development of environmental and socio-economic indicators that would identify threshold conditions. This will be addressed by the sub-committee in the future.

Action Plan Sub-committee. Bessie will be holding the first Action Plan sub-committee meeting on Thursday. They will continue editing and updating the Plan, prioritizing actions for implementation and identifying steps to move forward.

Refining Coordination Sub-committee roles. Bessie explained that part of the reason for forming a coordination sub-committee is to have participants help guide and take more ownership of the PCW. Sub-committee will meet monthly, or as needed. And the full committee will meet approximately quarterly. Bessie had everyone look over the proposed sub-committee roles, developed at the last June meeting, and asked if there were any suggestions for changes or additions. (An updated version of the Coordination Sub-committee Roles is attached.)

Marty suggested the sub-committee act as a clearinghouse of information, provide boilerplate language, review progress of the other committees, and help put all PCW work into a common, cohesive program perspective. Craig recommended that the coordination sub-committee avoid making recommendations to the other committees. There was discussion about making mandates versus suggestions, or guidance versus service, and how the PCW could define and or use its existing set of guiding principles to keep the sub-committees mindful of how the PCW is intended to operate. Craig expressed his concern for how the Inventory sub-committee may perceive any influence from other PCW committees. Marty suggested this committee could help build the needed trust, bring in more information, work to understand needs and what part of the inventory or Estuary Management Plan cause resistance. Bessie reminded the group that one of the original premises of the PCW is to provide a way for the community to address issues and make decisions without the usual fear and fighting. Maybe we could bring in people who have experienced similar situations and solutions.

There was some discussion about major events affecting the area including earthquake, tsunamis, and the impact dredging would have on the estuary, and whether or not the PCW would be able to address these.

Bessie recalled that the mission of the PCW is, in part, about addressing local resiliency to major changes such as these. Anne suggested we might get someone from CERT (Community Emergency Response Team) to participate on the PCW. Marty said we need more community members to diversify the group; there are currently too many staff and members who are paid to participate.

Bessie asked the group to think about the outreach objectives listed for this committee, and how that list could be modified and expanded upon. Jon reminded the group that it's been suggested by members that we host a "land use 101" class or series. Anne said she thought the website could be improved or simplified, and agreed to send comments about the website to staff.

Bessie asked members to:

1. bring their ideas about guiding principles for the PCW to the next sub-committee meeting, and
2. work on recruiting more members to the Coordination sub-committee

The next Coordination sub-committee meeting will be held in early September, after Labor Day. Alexa will send a Doodle poll to PCW members, with evening options, to determine the best time and day. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:00 pm.

PCW Coordination Sub-committee Roles (added 8/6/13)

1. Co-coordinates quarterly PCW full committee meetings with staff
2. Tracks and reports progress of all PCW sub-committees
3. Serves other PCW sub-committees
    a. Information clearinghouse
    b. Boilerplate for products
    c. Help identify opportunities
    d. Help build trust within PCW and within the community
4. Facilitates, educates and reminds PCW of its:
    a. purpose / intent
    b. Guiding principles and service to the community
    c. timeline
    d. deliverables
5. Coordinates PCW outreach
    a. Develops PCW identity and branding in the community
    b. Communicates with local media
    c. Articulates and clarifies what it is that PCW is doing
    d. Clarifies terminology and science
    e. Manages on-line presence
    f. Co-sponsors community 'science talks/walks'
    g. Coordinates trainings and workshops for PCW and community
        i. Some potential topics are "Land Use Planning 101", exploring the original mission of the CBEMP, mitigating the effects of climate change, tsunami and earthquake awareness and emergency response, and collaborative learning and facilitation training.
    h. Coordinates meetings to explore strategic alliances with local civic groups and organizations

Attachment 6

From: CORNU Craig
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 4:03 PM
To: 'Bessie Joyce'; Tom Hoesly; Allen M. Solomon; Donald Ivy; CLAIRE Christopher W; Jon Souder; Janet Rodgers; Sandra Messerle; Madeleine_VanderHeyden@fws.gov; Lou Leberti; RUDD Deborah; Bob Main; reg_pullen@blm.gov; Frankie Trask; Elise Hamner; Julie Jones; Ron Sadler; Brent Lerwill; Joe Drew; BECKER Larry; DJ Lauten and KACastelein; Marty Giles; Jody McCaffree; Reg Pullen; Jon B; knute.nemeth@gmail.com; Emily Wright (ewright@cooswatershed.org); SCHMITT Jenni
Subject: PCW Transition Team Recommendations for Phase 2

Hi Everybody-

As you know, the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds Transition Team has met twice in the past month to develop recommendations to the whole Partnership Steering Committee for how to proceed with Phase 2 of the PCW project. The team's recommendations are described below. **Please let me know if you approve of the recommendations by using the modified Fist-To-Five Decision Making Process also described below**.

Recommendations

1. Organize the PCW Phase 2 efforts around an update of the 1975-era Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan (universally acknowledged to be very much out of date). The Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan (CBEMP) is the land use guidance document the county developed and adopted 38 years ago using a public process. The county planning office uses that guidance to review proposed land uses in and around the Coos estuary.

The idea of updating the plan was raised by Don Ivy and was discussed at length at both transition team meetings and with Coos county commissioner Melissa Cribbins (liaison with planning department) who expressed great interest in the project. The transition team was attracted to the project because an update of the CBEMP…

- Would give our community a more up to date and solid foundation for evaluating opportunities. An updated plan would accurately account for the land use and resource management changes, including many land use zone changes, ownerships, jurisdictions and special designations, that have occurred in and around the estuary over the past 38 years.
- Is consistent with the PCW mission, goals and community vision (it's one of the high priority actions identified in the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds Action Plan).
- Would require the development of a common understanding of the environmental and socioeconomic conditions in the Coos estuary and associated sub-basins (Goal 16 and 17 inventory information) which the PCW Phase 1 has already begun with the completion of the Nov. 2012 edition of the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds State of the Watersheds assessment.
- Could be greatly facilitated by the use of the estuarine water circulation model being developed by University of Oregon scientists with partial support from the PCW Phase 2 grant funds (as discussed, the model can be used to simulate change in the estuary (e.g., shipping channel dredging, sea level rise scenarios…etc.) to explore the various likely effects of those changes).

- Would incorporate the use of the environmental and socioeconomic indicators being developed with PCW Phase 2 grant funds to keep the planning document responsive to both near- and long-term changes.
- Would require the use of a volunteer collaborative community process similar to the PCW planning process. There is funding in the Phase 2 grant to support additional training on community collaborative learning processes.
- Would take advantage of an estuary plan update support project being undertaken by the Department of Land Conservation and Development in 2013-2014.

The transition team reinforced during meeting discussions that the Phase 2 Partnership Steering Committee will need to represent the full suite of community stakeholders to effectively take on this complex project. We also discussed the fact that the project would need to be tackled in manageable pieces by PCW subcommittees (see below).

2. The transition team recommends that the Partnership Steering Committee conduct its work as a series of semi-autonomous sub-committees instead of as a single group that does most of its work during four hour meetings. The subcommittees would do their work in shorter, more focused meetings (as mentioned at the last Partnership Steering Committee meeting) and report their results to the whole Partnership Steering Committee at periodically held (quarterly?) whole committee meetings. The details of this arrangement still need to be worked out.

3. The transition team was briefed on the concept of organizing a PCW Leadership Team raised in the Gregg Walker evaluation but did not have time to discuss it further. The leadership team would consist of four or five Partnership Steering Committee members (both existing members and those to be recruited) who would join the project facilitators (Jon, Bessie, Craig) to plan the work of the Partnership Steering Committee (e.g., develop draft project goals, plan meetings, develop meeting agendas, contact committee members, recruit new members…). Everyone on the transition team I have spoken to informally about adopting this approach has approved of the idea. If you want to be a member of the PCW Leadership Team, please let me know.

4. The transition team recommends that the Partnership Steering Committee support PCW project facilitators (Craig and Bessie) in their development and delivery of presentations to community organizations to report the results of the PCW Phase 1 and to introduce the PCW Phase 2 to the community (many of whom will have heard from us when we presented the Phase 1 idea to them). Support would come in the form of reviewing the content of presentations and suggesting appropriate organizations and community events for presentations.

5. This is not a recommendation but a discussion note: Since the potential of the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds is bigger than a single project, there was some concern raised (mainly by me) that the PCW not turn entirely into a single project organization that goes away once the CBEMP update project is completed. Our group is diverse enough that several subcommittees could be coordinating multiple projects in parallel and I offered some examples. We ultimately figured out that it may be possible to start with a single project (CBEMP update) and take on other projects as they become community priorities.

Fist-To-Five Decision Making: Email-Style

"Should the Partnership Steering Committee move forward with next steps associated with the recommendations described above?"

Please respond to the question above letting me know via email how many fingers (or hands) you're holding up:

- 5 fingers = "I like this a lot, and think it's the best possible decision."
- 4 fingers = "This is fine."
- 3 fingers = "I'm in the middle somewhere. Like some of it, but not all."
- 2 fingers = "I don't much like this but I'll go along."
- 1 finger = "I don't like this at all but I can live with it and will not block consensus"
- Fist = "I vote NO. I object and will block consensus"
- Two Hands UP = "I'm confused and need more information!"

Thanks for offering your opinions-

Craig

Craig Cornu
South Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve
P.O. Box 5417
Charleston, OR 97420

Tel: (541) 888-8270 x: 301
Fax: (541) 888-2733
E-Mail: craig.cornu@state.or.us